DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 325 CG 018 905

TITLE Family Living Including Sex Education 1984-85. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE Dec 85
NOTE 58p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Evaluation; Decision Making; *Elementary School Curriculum; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *Family Life Education; Human Relations; *Secondary School Curriculum; Secondary School Students; *Sex Education
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This document describes an evaluation of the Family Living including Sex Education (FL/SE) program of the New York City public schools. The evaluation summary describes the FL/SE as a comprehensive, sequenced curriculum for kindergarten through high school on the topics of human growth and development, family relationships, friendship, reproduction, and decision-making. The summary further states that the targeted curriculum implementation has produced the following: (1) students have gained knowledge in FL/SE topics and confidence in discussing them; (2) staff development sessions were well-attended; (3) parents supported parent workshops; (4) individual districts formed councils addressing their needs (5) all districts wished to expand the program; and (6) more districts plan to implement FL/SE. The document includes a program description which discusses the administration and goals of the program. The evaluation methodology is described. Program implementation is discussed including advisory councils, staff responsibility, strategies, curriculum use, district plans, and problems encountered. Staff training and development and student outcomes are discussed. Recommendations for future program development are made. Tables and figures of evaluation data are included. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FAMILY LIVING INCLUDING
SEX EDUCATION
1984-85

OEA Evaluation Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T.K. Minter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT

December, 1985

Robert Tobias, Administrator

FAMILY LIVING INCLUDING
SEX EDUCATION
1984-85

Division of Curriculum
and Instruction
Charlotte Frank,
Executive Director

Health and Physical Education Unit
Sylvia Schechter, Director
Mel Warren, Assistant Director

Prepared by the

Instructional Support Evaluation Unit
John Schoener, Senior Manager
Robert Futterman, Manager
Jean Levitan, Evaluation Project Manager
Christine Helm, Evaluation Consultant
Barbara Whitney, Evaluation Consultant
Janice Eidus, Editorial Consultant
Elias Rosario, Office Associate

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of this report is the result of a collaborative effort of full-time staff and consultants. In addition to those whose names appear on the cover, Frank Guerrero provided invaluable assistance in the final production of this report; Sheryl Harawitz and Alan Pershing devoted many hours to data analysis; Madelon Finkel and Sanford Weinstein designed student achievement instruments; and Ron Miller and Sharon Walker provided much appreciated guidance and support. Finally, the Unit could not have completed this evaluation without the extended cooperation of Gerri Abelson, Fred Kaeser, Linda Lantieri, Peggy Tumminio, Lilliam Rosado, and Lolita Wood from the Health and Physical Education Unit of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction.

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The Family Living Including Sex Education (FL/SE) program is designed to implement a newly revised, comprehensive, sequenced curriculum in all New York City public schools (K-12) over the three-year period begun in fall, 1984. The curriculum material is structured for grades pre-kindergarten - two, three-four, five-six, junior high school, and high school. The FL/SE curriculum content includes human growth and development, family relationships, friendship, reproduction, and decision-making. The curriculum guide describes goals of the program, implementation strategies, teaching strategies, and resources.

FL/SE has been taught in the New York City public schools on a limited basis since 1967. The present three-year effort, however, is designed to involve the junior high schools and elementary schools in all community school districts (C.S.D.s). In addition, the three-year effort is also designed to involve all high schools throughout the city, including special education students. The curriculum implementation effort, funded by the Mayor's Office and the New York City Council, is the responsibility of the Health and Physical Education Unit (H.P.E.U.) of the New York City Board of Education's Division of Curriculum and Instruction.

The implementation process included the distribution of the final revised curriculum; the establishment of citywide, district, and local advisory councils; the orientation of parents to the curriculum; the training of teachers and administrators; the provision of resources for teaching; and the recruitment of community school districts into the program.

Eleven C.S.D.s were targeted for curriculum implementation in 1984-85: C.S.D.s 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 13, 15, 22, 29, 31, and 32. Districts 10 and 22 have been emphasizing community preparation and curriculum adaptation during this year. The other nine districts have been focusing on classroom implementation, as planned. In addition, the majority of high schools throughout the city are currently implementing the revised FL/SE curriculum.

The Office of Educational Assessment conducted an evaluation of FL/SE implementation activities during 1984-85. The evaluation focused on three areas: curriculum implementation, including the formation of district advisory councils and parent workshops; staff development; and student achievement. Data were collected from the following sources: interviews with C.S.D. personnel, community school board members, local administrators, teachers, parents, and H.P.E.U. staff; teacher and student opinion questionnaires; a test assessing student knowledge and attitudes; and documents recording H.P.E.U. activities. Major findings were as follows:

- Students have gained new knowledge about FL/SE topics; students report feeling more confident about discussing these topics.

- Staff development sessions were well-attended and were perceived by participants as useful, especially when they offered specific teaching strategies and a forum for sharing local concerns; teachers reported an increased level of comfort in teaching curriculum content.

- Parent workshops engendered enthusiasm and support from parents.

- Individual districts formed District Advisory Councils that were well-suited to their needs.

- Overall, reports from individual C.S.D.s indicated that H.P.E.U.'s support and assistance in implementing the program were very satisfactory.

- All districts currently implementing the program wish to expand it in 1985-86.

- Eight new C.S.D.s wish to begin curriculum implementation during fall, 1985.

The following recommendations are offered for further enhancement of program implementation and student gains:

- Encourage district responsibility for the FL/SE program, so that H.P.E.U. may serve as a central resource;

- Improve and expand staff development by offering advanced training sessions, by training smaller groups at a time, and by offering more specific teaching strategies appropriate to the developmental needs of different age groups of students;

- Continue efforts to provide more resource materials;

- Continue efforts to secure parent involvement by making parent workshops more accessible to working parents; also, increase efforts to provide materials for Spanish-speaking parents; and

- Respond to students' concerns; one of their major concerns is that more FL/SE discussion time be provided.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	Scope of this Report	3
II.	Program Description	4
	Administration	4
	Target C.S.D.s and High Schools	5
	FL/SE Program Prior to 1984-85	5
	Program Goals	6
III.	Evaluation Methodology	9
IV.	Program Implementation	11
	District Advisory Councils	11
	Local Advisory Councils	11
	Staff Responsibility for Implementation	12
	Strategies of Implementation	13
	Use of the Curriculum and Audiovisual Materials	15
	Relationships with other Agencies	16
	Parent Involvement	16
	Staff Perceptions of FL/SE Implementation	22
	Targeted District Plans for 1985-86	24
	Non-Targeted Districts	25
	Problems Encountered with FL/SE Implementation in C.S.D.s	26
	High Schools	27
V.	Staff Development	29
	Introductory Training Programs	30
	Follow-up Training	37
	Additional Staff Development Efforts	38
VI.	Student Outcomes	39
	Student Achievement and Attitudes	39
	Student Opinion Questionnaires	40
VII.	Conclusions and Recommendations	47

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table		Page
1	Number and Percentage of Schools Teaching FL/SE in 1984-85	14
2	Involvement of Parents in FL/SE Activities in Targeted Districts	19
3	Involvement of Parents in FL/SE Activities in Non-Targeted C.S.D.'s	20
4	Number of Meetings of FL/SE Coordinators in Targeted and Non-Targeted Districts with District Personnel and Cooperating Agencies	23
5	Number of Teachers and Supervisors from Targeted C.S.D.s Attending Centralized FL/SE Training 1984-85	32
6	Teacher Ratings of Comfort Teaching FL/SE Before and After August, 1984 Training Sessions	35
7	Analysis of Junior High School Students' Scores on the Sex Education Test	41
8	Analysis of High School Students' Scores on the Sex Education Test	42
9	Distribution of Student Responses to the Student Opinion Questionnaire	43
10	Student Responses to Student Opinion Questionnaire Item "What Were the Three Most Important Things You Learned?"	45
11	Student Responses to Student Opinion Questionnaire Item: "Suggestions for Making the Class Better"	46

FIGURE		
1	Agencies Working with Targeted C.S.D.s on FL/SE Programs	17

I. INTRODUCTION

This report evaluates the 1984-85 cycle of the Family Living Including Sex Education (FL/SE) program. The FL/SE program is designed to implement a newly revised, comprehensive, sequenced curriculum in all New York City public schools (K-12) over the three year period begun in fall, 1984. The curriculum material is structured for grades pre-kindergarten-two, three-four, five-six, junior high school, and high school. The FL/SE curriculum includes human growth and development, family relationships, friendship, reproduction, and decision-making. The curriculum guide describes goals of the program, implementation strategies, teaching strategies, and resources.

FL/SE has been taught in the New York City public schools on a limited basis since 1967. The present three year effort, however, is designed to involve junior high schools and elementary schools in all community school districts (C.S.D.s). In addition, this effort is also designed to involve all high schools throughout the city. The final goal of the program is to offer the revised FL/SE curriculum to all public school students, including special education students.

The curriculum implementation effort, funded by the Mayor's Office and the New York City Council, is the responsibility of the Health and Physical Education Unit (H.P.E.U.) of the New York City Board of Education's Division of Curriculum and Instruction. The role of the H.P.E.U. is to: develop community support for the program; orient parents to the FL/SE curriculum; prepare teachers to teach the curriculum; develop and conduct sex education programs for parents in order to help them deal more effectively with their children's sexuality; and serve as a resource for curriculum materials and teaching strategies.

Student program goals, as stated in the FL/SE curriculum, include:

- °assisting pupils in developing attitudes and clarifying values which are necessary for them to become effective members of the family and society;
- °providing a body of content which can be used as a basis for responsible decision-making;
- °helping pupils understand the physiological changes that occur during their periods of growth and development; and
- °helping pupils develop a personal code of values that will enhance their self-esteem and serve as a guide for responsible behavior.

In addition, other program goals include: training teachers and supervisors in order to facilitate implementation; conducting parent workshops to help parents become familiar with the program's objectives and its curriculum content and to train them as parent educators; bringing at least seven new C.S.D.s into the program; developing appropriate audiovisual materials; and completing a final version of the FL/SE curriculum. H.P.E.U. is also working to establish positive relations with various agencies that are concerned with FL/SE issues. A long-range program goal is for each C.S.D. at the end of the three-year implementation effort to be responsible for administering its own program. H.P.E.U. will then serve as a central resource.

The evaluation conducted by the Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) focused on three areas: curriculum implementation, including the formation of district advisory councils and the development of parent workshops; staff development; and student achievement. Data were collected from the following sources: interviews with C.S.D. personnel, community

school board members, local administrators, teachers, parents, and H.P.E.U. staff; teacher and student opinion questionnaires; tests assessing student knowledge and attitudes; and documents recording H.P.E.U. activities.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report presents the complete results of the evaluation of the 1984-85 FL/SE program. Chapter II of this report includes a description of the program and the target population; Chapter III describes evaluation methods; Chapter IV contains an assessment of program implementation. In Chapters V and VI the evaluation findings on staff development and student achievement are presented. Finally, Chapter VII presents conclusions and recommendations.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

ADMINISTRATION

The FL/SE curriculum implementation effort is the responsibility of the Health and Physical Education Unit (H.P.E.U.) of the New York City Board of Education's Division of Curriculum and Instruction. The H.P.E.U. staff coordinate activities at the local, district, borough, and city levels. These activities include:

- meeting with representatives of district and school-wide constituency groups to familiarize them with the curriculum;
- providing staff development and technical assistance to teachers and supervisors implementing the curriculum; and
- conducting training sessions to review curriculum methods and materials.

During 1984-85, five of the FL/SE coordinators worked directly with staff and supervisors in the C.S.D.s throughout the city. One high school coordinator worked with high schools throughout the city and also served as the primary liaison to community agencies.

The FL/SE curriculum is not mandated by the Board of Education; therefore, the decision to implement the curriculum rests with individual community school boards, superintendents, and schools. The curriculum has been mandated by the community school boards in C.S.D.s 1 and 31 for all grade levels and in C.S.D.s 2 and 13 for junior high. On October 24, 1984, Chancellor's Memorandum #14 was issued, instructing all C.S.D.s to form advisory councils and parent groups in order to encourage community feedback and to facilitate curriculum implementation.

TARGET C.S.D.S AND HIGH SCHOOLS

The 1984-85 FL/SE program was designed to implement the curriculum in one third of the 32 C.S.D.s throughout the city. Eleven C.S.D.s responded to the open invitation to participate in the FL/SE curriculum extended by H.P.E.U. in the spring, 1984 and were targeted for curriculum implementation in 1984-85. These districts were: 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 13, 15, 22, 29, 31, and 32. Districts 10 and 22, however, chose to emphasize community preparation and curriculum adaptation during 1984-85; in subsequent years they will focus on classroom implementation. Therefore, nine of the targeted districts actually worked on implementing the revised curriculum in the classroom. In general, junior high schools and elementary schools in these C.S.D.s were using the curriculum at an introductory level because most of the teachers had either not previously taught FL/SE at all, or had only taught certain aspects of it.

The program was also designed to facilitate implemention of the FL/SE curriculum in one third of the high schools throughout the city during the 1984-85 school year. Much of the curriculum content was not new to the high schools, since many of them have been incorporating some FL/SE content into their curricula since 1967.

FL/SE PROGRAM PRIOR TO 1984-85

The original FL/SE curriculum dates back to 1967, and some C.S.D.'s have been teaching it since then to varying degrees, with the most extensive implementation taking place at the high school level. C.S.D.s 2, 4, and 29 reported being involved in piloting the revised curriculum prior to 1984-85.

C.S.D.s 2, 10, 13, 15, 22, and 29 indicated that budgetary cuts had reduced their resources and ability to implement the curriculum, but that some portions of the original curriculum were still being taught. C.S.D.s 4, 9, and 32 reported that they have been actively involved in revising the FL/SE curriculum. C.S.D. 1 reported working with a local hospital on a plan for elementary schools. The revised curriculum has been viewed by most C.S.D.s, however, as a new curriculum to be introduced to their elementary schools and junior high schools.

The range of preparation activities varied from district to district depending upon previous involvement with the curriculum. C.S.D. 13 reported that it had needed only a small amount of preparation in order to implement the revised curriculum since it had previously mandated the original curriculum for the junior high schools. C.S.D.s 2 and 4, which had piloted the revised curriculum for the past few years, also reported needing only a small amount of preparation. C.S.D. 22 chose to prepare its own curriculum and to provide workshops for the community with limited involvement from H.P.E.U. Generally, H.P.E.U. coordinators helped to conduct orientation workshops for community school board members, members of the community, principals, and teachers.

PROGRAM GOALS

This section presents a description of the general implementation goals of the FL/SE program. Specific H.P.E.U. goals for the program varied from district to district, depending upon the district's history with FL/SE and its implementation status at the beginning of the year.

Staff Development

One of the program's goals for 1984-85 was to train a total of 1200 teachers and supervisors from C.S.D.'s and high schools to facilitate curriculum implementation. A related goal was to involve 90 schools representing 10 C.S.D.s with the program. The training package was designed to include 24 hours of centralized training to be held over a four-day period, with at least six hours of follow-up training offered after participants had experience with the curriculum. Teachers and supervisors were to be given an opportunity to become familiar with FL/SE curriculum content, teaching strategies, and resources.

Parent Workshops

A second program goal was to conduct parent workshops in order to help parents become familiar with the program's objectives and its curriculum content. Improving communication between parents and children about FL/SE issues is one of the program's central concerns. Parents who attend the workshops should be better able to communicate with their children about the curriculum content.

New C.S.D.s

A third program goal was to bring at least seven new C.S.D.s into the program by the beginning of the 1985-86 school year. C.S.D.s were to have community school board and superintendent approval before beginning implementation.

Audiovisual Materials

A fourth program goal was to develop relevant and appropriate audiovisual materials.

FL/SE Curriculum

A fifth program goal was to approve, print, and distribute the final version of the curriculum.

Relationships With Other Agencies

Another program goal was for H.P.E.U. to establish positive working relationships with various agencies concerned with FL/SE issues.

Long-range Goals

A long-range program goal is that at the end of the three-year implementation effort, each C.S.D. will be responsible for administering its own program. In order for this to occur each C.S.D. will have trained administrators at both the district and school level overseeing implementation.

III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

O.E.A. used several qualitative and quantitative techniques in evaluating the extent and quality of program implementation and its impact upon students. These included an examination and analysis of monthly log forms kept by FL/SE coordinators, payroll vouchers of participating teachers, evaluation forms completed by teachers and administrators, questionnaires completed by teachers, and tests designed to assess student attitudes and knowledge. The high school achievement test had been used to evaluate the curriculum during 1983-84.* O.E.A. designed and piloted a junior high school test following the model of the high school instrument. Both tests measure students' knowledge of physiological growth and development, and assess students' attitudes related to self-esteem, peer pressure, decision-making, gender roles, family, and tolerance of others' values. These test items were designed to assess students' recognition of desired behaviors, rather than actual changes in behavior. The junior high instrument contained 27 knowledge and 20 attitude items. The high school instrument contained 32 knowledge and 30 attitude items. Both instruments were reviewed by the H.P.E.U. and a subcommittee of the Citywide Advisory Council.

O.E.A. also developed a separate student opinion questionnaire which asked students about their reactions to the atmosphere of the classroom, feelings about the curriculum, communication patterns with friends and family, and suggestions for improving the program.

---

*The high school test was developed during 1983-84 by a consultant contracted by the program.

In addition, O.E.A. conducted interviews with:

- H.P.E.U. staff including the Director of H.P.E.U., the Assistant Director of H.P.E.U., five borough coordinators for FL/SE, and the high school coordinator for FL/SE;
- C.S.D. level personnel including community school board members, district superintendents, health coordinators/supervisors, and other administrative personnel;
- School level personnel including principals, assistant principals, and instructional staff; and
- Community members including parents and community agency representatives.

O.E.A. evaluators focused on selected areas and issues concerning program implementation. These included: the formation of district and local advisory councils; the relationship of the history of FL/SE involvement in each district to current implementation; the plans of targeted districts for program continuation and expansion in 1985-86; parent involvement; implementation in high schools; and recruitment of non-targeted districts. Staff development (discussed in Chapter V) and student achievement and attitudes (discussed in Chapter VI) were also examined in detail.

IV. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

DISTRICT ADVISORY COUNCILS

On October 24, 1984, Chancellor's Memorandum #14 was issued, instructing all C.S.D.s to form FL/SE advisory councils in order to encourage community feedback and to facilitate curriculum implementation. These advisory councils were to review the appropriateness of the curriculum for their district and recommend revisions if necessary.

While the Chancellor's memo provided guidelines for the structure and function of district advisory councils (D.A.C.'s), the individual C.S.D.s varied in their needs and therefore structured their D.A.C.'s accordingly. D.A.C.s reviewed the curriculum, previewed films and other materials, monitored the implementation process, and addressed any issues brought to their attention by parents and/or community groups. (O.E.A. observed that prior district involvement with implementation reduced the need for community preparation in 1984-85.) The frequency with which the D.A.C.s met varied from district to district. Depending upon the stage of implementation, meetings were held monthly or several times during the school year. In general, the district advisory council membership consisted of C.S.D. office personnel, parents, clergy, principals, and teachers. Some C.S.D.s also had community school board members on their councils and considered FL/SE coordinators as members. Despite variations in membership and focus of activities, D.A.C.s served a critical role, particularly as the forum for addressing a C.S.D.'s specific needs.

LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

Participation in the FL/SE program is voluntary, and the program is

also designed to maintain the autonomy of local schools. Therefore, individual schools were encouraged by the chancellor to form local advisory councils (L.A.C.s). Some schools implementing the program have formed local advisory councils; others have not. C.S.D.s 2, 13, 15, and 32 have indicated that all of their implementing schools have formed local advisory councils. C.S.D.s 1, 29, and 31 on the other hand, discouraged the formation of such councils, wanting to maintain consistency of the program throughout the district. They were also concerned that local councils would not be well enough informed about FL/SE to make appropriate modifications.

STAFF RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

In C.S.D.s 1, 2, 10, 13 and 32, the health coordinator/supervisor was responsible for facilitating the implementation of the FL/SE curriculum. In other C.S.D.s without a district level health coordinator responsibility for implementation fell elsewhere. In C.S.D. 4 the responsibility for the program rested with the Director of Pupil Personnel Services, in C.S.D. 9 with the Coordinator of Guidance and Family Living, in C.S.D. 15 with the Director of Alternative Programs, in C.S.D. 22 with the Acting Interim Deputy Superintendent and District Coordinator for FL/SE, and in C.S.D. 31 the special assistant to the superintendent and the supervising principal were responsible. Also closely involved with the implementation process were other district personnel such as the superintendent, deputy superintendent, drug coordinators, director of funded programs, and community school board members.

In C.S.D.s 1 and 9 the community school board was also closely involved with implementation. In both districts, community school board members were involved in choosing their pilot schools, and they continue to monitor

the program. The community school boards of C.S.D.'s 1 and 31 mandated that FL/SE be taught at all levels, and C.S.D.s 2 and 13 mandated that the program be taught at the junior high level.

The position of the individual charged with coordinating the program at the C.S.D. level was found to be less important than having a single individual who is a strong leader and supporter of the program. This finding is consistent with the H.P.E.U. goal that each C.S.D. should have a person whose sole responsibility is to oversee the implementation of FL/SE, particularly as H.P.E.U. increases the number of C.S.D.s serviced.

STRATEGIES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Table 1 presents the number and percentage of schools in targeted C.S.D.s where FL/SE was taught during 1984-85, as reported by district office personnel. In five of the eight C.S.D.s, a higher percentage of junior high schools were teaching FL/SE than elementary schools. The number of schools where the FL/SE curriculum was being taught is not, on its own, a clear indicator of the degree of program implementation, since participating schools were using a wide variety of implementation strategies.

The C.S.D.s implemented the program in different ways. For example, C.S.D.s 1 and 9 chose only a few schools to serve as pilots for the 1984-85 school year. C.S.D. 31, however, used the curriculum in all its schools for grades K-6. In general, a comprehensive effort to implement the curriculum in the classroom only occurred where teachers had received training offered by H.P.E.U.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Schools Teaching FL/SE in 1984-85

	Elementary		Junior High	
Targeted C.S.D.	Number of Schools Teaching FL/SE	Percentage of Schools Teaching FL/SE[a]	Number of Schools Teaching FL/SE	Percentage of Schools Teaching FL/SE[a]
1	4	29%	3	75%
2	23	88%	7	100%
4	16	59%	12	46%
9	2	8%	4	44%
13	18	100%	17	100%
15	6	30%	2	40%
29	15	65%	5	100%
31	39[b]	100%[b]	9[c]	100%[c]
32	12	100%	4	80%

[a] Calculations based upon information provided by C.S.D. personnel.

[b] This figure does not come from district personnel, but was inferred from the mandate that FL/SE be offered in all schools K-6 for the 1984-85 school year.

[c] C.S.D. 31 only has intermediate schools.

° In five of the eight C.S.D.s a higher percentage of junior high schools than elementary schools were teaching FL/SE.

The amount of time given to the curriculum also varied from one C.S.D. to another and from school to school. Sessions devoted to the curriculum ranged from six to thirty over the school year. Some classes received instruction in FL/SE as often as four times a week, while others received such instruction once a week. Some schools offered the curriculum as an elective course.

USE OF THE CURRICULUM AND AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

The final version of the curriculum was completed and distributed early in 1985. In addition an addendum was written on child sexual abuse.

Modifications to the curriculum varied from deleting or adding material to mandating or emphasizing a particular topic, such as child sexual abuse. Modifications took place both at the district level and sometimes at the school level. For example, J.H.S. 111 in C.S.D. 32 stressed the differences among families and the religious issues related to FL/SE. C.S.D. 9 chose to emphasize family concepts; teachers in C.S.D. 15 introduced child abuse prevention and safety in the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten levels rather than waiting until grades three-four; C.S.D. 22 expanded the section on child abuse and included more teaching strategies; and C.S.D. 32 modified the curriculum so that it manifested increased sensitivity to the needs of foster children, adopted children, and Islamic children.

The audiovisual materials developed in 1984-85 were cited by H.P.E.U. as having been very useful in securing the participation of the eight new districts that had signed on for 1985-86. This was especially true of a slide presentation designed to orient parents to the curriculum. Another newly developed audiovisual aid was a 15 minute soap opera, "Days of Decision".

This innovative program, designed by C.S.D. 21 with help from H.P.E.U., is a teenage drama depicting problem solving and decision-making situations. H.P.E.U. was also involved in the production of a film designed to help teachers discuss child sexual abus in the classroom. In addition, a New York City bank donated to each high school a copy of "Looking for Love," a film on teenage pregnancy.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER AGENCIES

Working relationships were established with other offices within the Board of Education, and in addition, H.P.E.U. and individual C.S.D.s reported having worked closely on implementation with a variety of other New York City agencies. H.P.E.U. worked with Planned Parenthood, the Citywide Campaign for Family Living Including Sex Education in New York City's Public Schools, Teen Pregnancy Network, the Sex and Child Abuse Task Forces, Askable Parents, March of Dimes, and the New York City Health Department. Individual districts also worked with agencies and hospitals in their communities. Figure 1 provides a partial listing of agencies working with participating C.S.D.s.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Parent workshops were conducted by H.P.E.U. and the individual C.S.D.s in order to help parents become more familiar with the program's objectives and its curriculum content. Communication between parents and children about FL/SE issues is a major program concern. Program staff believe that parent involvement is key to program success. Parents who understand the curriculum content will be better able to discuss the issues with their children.

Figure 1
Agencies Working with Targeted C.S.D.s
on FL/SE Programs

C.S.D.	Agencies
1	Beth Israel Hospital
2	Hudson Guild Lenox Hill House Chinatown Planning Board
4	Boriken Neighborhood Health Center
9	Planned Parenthood Task Force Against Child Abuse Bronx Teen Pregnancy Network Health Consortium
13	Floating Hospital Planned Parenthood NYC Health Department
15	none cited
29	Long Island Jewish Hospital Teen Pregnancy/Abuse Prevention
31	Staten Island Sex Abuse Network
32	Woodhull Hospital Wyckoff Heights Hospital St. Mary's Family Health Center NYC Department of Health The Bridge

° Most C.S.D.s have established working relationships with local agencies and hospitals interested in FL/SE implementation.

During the fall, 1984, programs for parents were organized for all targeted C.S.D.s. H.P.E.U. scheduled orientation workshops for parents from junior high schools and their feeder elementary schools. At these workshops, program goals were discussed. Parents had the opportunity to ask questions and voice concerns. In addition, four sequential workshops were scheduled by H.P.E.U. in each C.S.D. in which parents could discuss FL/SE concepts. One of these workshops usually focused on anatomy and physiology; another on psychosexual development; a third on child sexual abuse; and a fourth on communication between parents and children. In some cases, outside agencies also presented information.

In general, either the district superintendent or the principal sent flyers to all parents announcing meetings. Meetings were held in the mornings, afternoons, and evenings; the hours were chosen to ensure the greatest attendance. Reports of "good" attendance varied from C.S.D. to C.S.D., with attendance ranging from 10-250 parents. These data are presented in Tables 2 and 3. In general, many more parents from targeted C.S.D.s participated in orientation workshops than content workshops. While parents responded to all opportunities to become involved with the FL/SE program, only a few parents in each C.S.D. participated in policy-making meetings. (H.P.E.U. focused its efforts on parent orientation workshops in non-targeted districts. Attendance at these varied widely.) While attendance at parent meetings in some cases appeared low, district and local administrators reported that there was support for the program within the community. In general, parents who were leaders within the community were most involved in the FL/SE implementation process. In the few cases where parents were opposed to the program, meetings were arranged with various school personnel

Table 2

Involvement of Parents in FL/SE Activities in Targeted Districts[a]

C.S.D.	Planning Meetings		Orientation Workshops		Content Workshops		D.A.C./L.A.C.[b]	
	Number of Meetings	Median Attendance	Number of Meetings	Median Attendance	Number of Meetings	Median Attendance	Number of Meetings	Median Attendance
1	3	22	10	20			3	22
2	2	6	16	75	7	20	2	6
4	2	8	10	10	2	84	2	8
9			7	12	9	14	3	20[c]
10			1	20			3	22[c]
13	1	2	4	10			1	8
15	1	2	1	2	2	24	6	5
29	20	3	10	33	16	10	4	11
31	3	3	9	90	9	16	2	3
32	1	2	10	13	3	9	12	6

[a] Data drawn from FL/SE coordinator log sheets.

[b] District Advisory Council/Local Advisory Council

[c] Attendance reported included all meeting participants; parents were not recorded separately

° Parent involvement was greatest at orientation workshops.

Table 3

Involvement of Parents in FL/SE Activities
in Non-Targeted C.S.D.s[a]

C.S.D.	Orientation Workshops		D.A.C.[b]	
	Number of Meetings	Median Attendance	Number of Meetings	Median Attendance
5	8	43	2	2
11	1	22		
17	1	14		
18	3	112	4	2
21	6	19	2	8
25	1	15		
26	2[c]	125		
27	3	65		
28	4	25		

[a] Data drawn from FL/SE coordinator log sheets
[b] District Advisory Council
[c] A meeting of 200 parents was called by Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament

° Median attendance varied widely from 6-125 parents at district orientation workshops.

and in almost all cases parents' concerns were resolved.

A language barrier did exist in C.S.D.s with large Hispanic populations, although various attempts were made to communicate with Spanish-speaking parents. In C.S.D. 1, a team of three Spanish-speaking parents attended all the parent orientation meetings and translated information. Bilingual workshops were offered in C.S.D. 4, and in C.S.D. 9 the bilingual FL/SE coordinator translated during workshops. Inadequate translation remains a problem, however; all written materials are in English. H.P.E.U. has requested help from the Office of Bilingual Education in translating materials.

Informal conversations with parents throughout the year revealed their high degree of satisfaction with the program. In addition, at the end of the school year in-depth interviews were conducted with nine parents from targeted C.S.D.s 2, 9, 10, and 32. In C.S.D. 2, an interview was conducted with the president of the Parents Association of a participating junior high school. Also in C.S.D. 2, an interview was conducted with the president of the Parents Council of one of the elementary schools.

Parents repeatedly commented that FL/SE is important for all children. They also commented that they were pleased that their concerns were heard and addressed. In general, parents viewed the program as especially valuable because it helps children learn how to handle themselves in potentially "rough" neighborhoods and because it provides children with a sense of their self-worth. Parents considered the parent workshops worthwhile because they provided an opportunity for them to share their concerns about sex education and ways of discussing it with their children. The parent workshops were also considered valuable. Parents did indicate, however, the need for more frequent parent meetings. They also requested more time during meetings in

which they could express their feelings about FL/SE issues. One suggestion offered by parents to improve parent involvement was having teachers send parents a class syllabus. In general, those parents who were interviewed believed that FL/SE teachers should possess the following: sensitivity to ethnic differences; sensitivity to the material contained in the FL/SE curriculum; a desire to be innovative; a high degree of intelligence; an ability to develop a rapport with parents and children; a geniune concern for children; and honesty, directness, and confidence.

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF FL/SE IMPLEMENTATION

The evaluation team asked C.S.D. personnel and H.P.E.U. staff members about the implementation efforts made during 1984-85. H.P.E.U. staff members believed that in C.S.D.s 2, 4, 9, 13, 15, 29, and 32, the presence of a strong district-level supervisor of FL/SE had been instrumental in fostering program success. H.P.E.U. staff also mentioned the strong support from the community school board and from parents in C.S.D.s 2, 9, and 31 as factors contributing to program success.

District personnel from all of the targeted districts believed that the support and assistance they had received from H.P.E.U. strengthened program implementation. Table 4 presents the number of meetings FL/SE coordinators held with district personnel and cooperating agencies in targeted and non-targeted districts. Many district personnel expressed concern that, due to the addition of new C.S.D.s in 1985-86, H.P.E.U. would not be able to offer them as much support as previously. The following specific issues were also raised:

- personnel from C.S.D. 1 believed that there was a lack of sophistication about cultural issues in the curriculum;

Table 4

Number of Meetings of FL/SE Coordinators in Targeted and Non-Targeted Districts with District Personnel and Cooperating Agencies

Districts	Orientation	Follow-up Training	Planning	D.A.C./L.A.C.[b]	Other	Total
Targeted						
1	2		2	1	2	7
2	4	8	5	2		19
4	3	3	10		1	17
9	3	5	3	3	3	17
10	2				3	5
13	1	1	10			12
15	2	4	1	6	2	15
22			5		1	6
29	3	8	21			32
31	14	14	9	2		39
32	4	11	6	14		35
Non-Targeted						
5	4	1	2			7
6	3					3
7	2		1			3
11	1					1
12	4					4
18	2	3	2	4		11
19			2			2
21	5		10	1	2	18
25	1					1
27	6	1				7
28	7		2			9
30			2			2

[a] Data drawn from FL/SE coordinator log sheets.
[b] District Advisory Council/Local Advisory Council

° FL/SE coordinators met with distict personnel and cooperating agencies in both targeted and non-targeted districts.

- personnel from C.S.D.s 1, 2, 4, 9, 13, and 32 would like more support materials such as audiovisual aids, books, and speakers, especially for Spanish-speaking students and parents;

- personnel from C.S.D. 13 noted that while FL/SE content is part of the health education curriculum, the students' health textbook does not contain enough material about the curriculum;

- personnel from C.S.D. 1 and 2 requested more support for staff members in the field;

- personnel from C.S.D. 4 would like to be responsible for their own staff development; and

- C.S.D. district 13 would like a better public relations effort made through the media.

TARGETED DISTRICT PLANS FOR 1985-86

One measure of the program's successful implementation is that all C.S.D.s where FL/SE was taught during 1984-85 reported plans to continue and expand the program. Plans for 1985-86 are as follows:

- C.S.D. 1 will expand the program to seven more elementary schools;

- C.S.D. 2 will expand the program to three more elementary schools;

- C.S.D. 4 will expand the program within already participating schools, with an emphasis on special education classes;

- C.S.D. 9 will expand to three more elementary schools and to five junior high schools;

- C.S.D. 13 will expand the program within individual schools;

- C.S.D. 15 will expand the program to include its bilingual students:

- C.S.D. 22 will continue to prepare the community to adopt the program;

- C.S.D. 29 will expand the program into eight more elementary schools; and will also train teachers in most schools;

- C.S.D. 31 will expand the program from K-6 into the 7th and 8th grades; and

- C.S.D. 32 will train more teachers.

NON-TARGETED DISTRICTS

In order to accomplish the three-year goal of citywide implementation the work of H.P.E.U. must be expanded into all C.S.D.s. One H.P.E.U. goal for 1984-85 was to bring at least seven new C.S.D.s into the program for 1985-86. Therefore, H.P.E.U. contacted all superintendents of C.S.D.s not implementing the curriculum to solicit their interest and meet with the community school board, school principals, parent councils, and parents from individual schools within the districts. H.P.E.U. encouraged these districts to form district advisory councils before they began staff development and classroom implementation. Eight C.S.D.s (3, 5, 12, 16, 18, 21, 25, and 28) have signed on for 1985-86.*

During 1984-85, H.P.E.U. met with a variety of groups and individuals in each of the following districts.

- C.S.D. 3: Deputy Superintendent and Community School Board.
- C.S.D. 5: Community School Board Superintendent's Advisory Council, Director of Funded Programs, principals at district-wide meeting, parents, Parent Site Management Council, the Parent Council, and individual Parents Associations.
- C.S.D. 6: Superintendent and the Director of Pupil Personnel Services.
- C.S.D. 7: Principals from each school.
- C.S.D. 8: Parents from each school in the district.
- C.S.D. 12: Health Coordinator and the Coordinator of Alternative Schools.
- C.S.D. 16: Health Coordinator.
- C.S.D. 17: Superintendent, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Director of Science Programs, the Drug Guidance and Health Director, parents, and district-wide Parents Council.

---

* Staff development for these new districts took place during summer, 1985; also, in fall 1984, C.S.D. 18's drug and guidance counselors received 16 hours of training.

- C.S.D. 18: Community School Board, (three members received FL/SE training), principals at district-wide meetings and at individual schools, all drug and guidance counselors, and parents at three district-wide orientation meetings.

- C.S.D. 21: Teachers, principals, parents, and the Parent Advisory Council.

- C.S.D. 24: Community School Board.

- C.S.D. 26: Catholic Parents at their request, and the President's Council.

- C.S.D. 27: Community school board and parents.

- C.S.D. 28: Community school board, superintendent, curriculum coordinator, principals at individual schools, the Parents Council and parents from individual schools.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED WITH FL/SE IMPLEMENTATION IN C.S.D.s

Because the FL/SE curriculum focuses on material of a sensitive nature, it has often been in the public eye. In general, however, the program has been successfully implemented in the C.S.D.s due to strong public support.

In some C.S.D.s, FL/SE implementation has been delayed because community school board members have opposed the program. In order to help community school board members understand the program and its goals, H.P.E.U. has offered formal presentations describing the program and addressing concerns. H.P.E.U. has also revised policy for 1985-86 so that both the district superintendent and the community school board must sign a consent form indicating their support for FL/SE before any district staff may be sent for training. This new policy will help to insure that communication about FL/SE between the district superintendents and the school board is maintained.

In other cases, obstacles to implementation stemmed from superintendent resistence to the program. Some superintendents were unwilling to work with a centralized curriculum; others were newly appointed in a district and

therefore needed to become familiar with the community prior to making a commitment to implementation; and others believed that they had more pressing educational concerns to address.

HIGH SCHOOLS

FL/SE has been part of the health education curriculum in the high schools since 1967; health education is mandated for students in the eleventh grade. As a result, H.P.E.U. has not had to as actively encourage program adoption on the high school level as compared to the district level.

High School Coordinator

The H.P.E.U. high school coordinator is responsible for the 110 high schools within the city. In 1984-85, the FL/SE high school coordinator attended one borough-wide meeting in each of these boroughs: Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, and Staten Island. At these meetings, the high school coordinator discussed FL/SE implementation with high school assistant principals for health and physical education. In general, the H.P.E.U. high school coordinator responded to individual school requests for support. During 1984-85, such requests resulted in the following measures: local training took place at Clara Barton, Taft, and Grover Cleveland high schools; and H.P.E.U. made a presentation to all high school assistant principals on the film, "Looking for Love," which deals with teen pregnancy. Also, H.P.E.U. provided various high schools throughout the city with "Family Life Theatre" performances related to FL/SE issues. In addition, the H.P.E.U. coordinator organized meetings with parent groups when requested to do so, although parents of high school students have not requested many such meetings.

Advisory Councils

The Citywide Advisory Council, formed to provide guidance to the entire FL/SE program, also served in an advisory capacity to the high schools. The Council, which met twice during 1984-85, had broad-based representation from parents, teachers, family-related agencies within the city, clergy, the Mayor's office, and the H.P.E.U. staff. On the local level, H.P.E.U. suggested that the high schools may use their consultative councils as their FL/SE advisory councils. These councils review high school curricula; by adding representatives from the community, they can form subcommittees to advise on FL/SE matters.

Individual High Schools

O.E.A. conducted in-depth interviews at five high schools throughout the city in an attempt to examine the implementation of the FL/SE curriculum at the local level. The high schools visited were South Shore, Port Richmond, Humanities, Brandeis, and Beach Channel.

In general, high school teachers were using the revised FL/SE curriculum and enriching their past programs. In a number of cases, students were participating in the local advisory councils. By and large, high school staff reported that H.P.E.U. was very responsive to their needs. The one repeated complaint was the lack of access to needed audiovisual materials.

V. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

This chapter contains information about the staff development component of the FL/SE program. H.P.E.U. strongly believes that offering teachers and supervisors training in classroom teaching strategies and a forum in which to share relevant concerns helps to facilitate program implementation.

The major staff development efforts conducted by the H.P.E.U. for the targeted districts and high schools were:

- Introductory training programs: Four 24-hour training programs each held over four days, for teachers and supervisors.

    1) Summer, 1984 Training: Citywide training for districts and high schools planning on implementing the program, (August, 1984).

    2) Special Education: Training for special education personnel selected as potential turnkey trainers, (January-March, 1985).

    3) Training by Borough: Training by borough for teachers and supervisors not previously trained for each of the targeted C.S.D.s, (June, 1985).

    4) Summer, 1985 Training: Citywide training for implementing districts and high schools, (June/July, 1985).

- Follow-up Training: Three six-hour follow-up programs for trained school personnel, prepared according to participants' teaching level:

    1) Citywide training for elementary and intermediate/ junior high school teachers, (March, 1985).

    2) Citywide training for high school teachers, (January, 1985).

    3) Citywide training for high school teachers on parenting, conducted in conjunction with the March of Dimes, (March, 1985).

In addition, H.P.E.U. staff met individually with teachers and supervisors upon request, and were available for consultation by phone. It was intended that those trained in the summer, 1984 training program would be teaching FL/SE during the 1984-85 school year.*

H.P.E.U. attempted to accommodate as many requests for training as possible. H.P.E.U.'s goal is to train a minimum of two persons in each school in each participating C.S.D. Principals of intermediate and junior high schools are encouraged to attend training sessions along with two teachers and the guidance counselor. Principals of elementary schools are also encouraged to attend, and to send two teachers from grades kindergarten-two, two teachers from grades three and four, and two teachers from grades five and six.

INTRODUCTORY TRAINING PROGRAMS

During spring, 1984, all C.S.D.s throughout the city were informed of the forthcoming implementation of the FL/SE curriculum. At that time, C.S.D. superintendents were invited to sign on for the program. In June, 1984, all C.S.D.s indicating interest in participating in the summer training program and all high school principals were asked to identify staff who were "highly motivated, respected by colleagues, administrators and parents, and sensitive to the developmental needs and concerns of children" to receive training. Each of the 11 targeted districts implementing the program during 1984-85 was allotted 30 positions for the summer program, in addition to

---

* Two C.S.D.s involved in the summer, 1984 training did not implement the curriculum in the classroom, reducing the number of C.S.D.s actively implementing the program in this initial year to nine.

a position for the person supervising program implementation on the district level. High school principals were asked to send three teachers from each school. Teachers participating in the summer training received an hourly stipend of $19.23 per hour for a total of 24 hours of training.

Summer, 1984 Training

From August 27-30, 1984, H.P.E.U. conducted an FL/SE training session for 449 community school district and high school staff at Norman Thomas High School.* (See Table 5 for data by C.S.D.) The four-day training program focused on improving participants' knowledge of and comfort and familiarity with appropriate teaching strategies. Of the 449 personnel trained, 416 were teachers; 148 taught at the elementary level, 121 at the intermediate/junior high level, and 147 at the high school level. The balance were supervisors and non-teaching personnel. Ten of the 11 C.S.D.s which at that time were targeted for initial implementation sent teachers to be trained. C.S.D 4 conducted 30 hours of its own staff development training in the spring of 1984, attended by 24 teachers and supervisors; coordinated by the district personnel responsible for FL/SE, the training was conducted by agencies active in providing services to the community.

At the high school level, training was received by 22 teachers from 13 schools in the Bronx, 56 teachers from 30 schools in Brooklyn, 25 teachers from 17 schools in Manhattan, 29 teachers from 18 schools in Queens, and 15 teachers from six schools in Staten Island.

---

* Staff development statistics for this training session were compiled by O.E.A. from payroll vouchers submitted by teachers. H.P.E.U. estimates were slightly higher.

Table 5

Number of Teachers and Supervisors from Targeted C.S.D.s
Attending Centralized FL/SE Training
1984-85

C.S.D.	August, 1984 (Citywide)[a]	June, 1985 (By Borough)[b]	June/July 1985 (Citywide)[b]	Total
1	5	10	14	29
2	39	13	17	69
4	24[c]	16	16	56
9	18	33	13	64
10	36	--[d]	--[d]	36
13	27	11	21	59
15	38	13	13	64
22	27	--[d]	--[d]	27
29	11	13	22	46
31	38	40	16	94
32	39	9	22	70
Total	302	158	154	614

[a] Data sources were the payroll vouchers submitted by teachers for attending training.

[b] The data source were the records submitted by FL/SE borough coordinators.

[c] C.S.D. 4 conducted its own 30-hour training session.

[d] C.S.D. requested training, but since no commitment had been made to implementation, H.P.E.U. did not allocate space.

° C.S.D.s had three opportunities to send teachers and supervisors for 24 hour centralized training. An equal number of spaces was allocated for each C.S.D., yet actual participation varied widely.

Teacher Evaluation of Summer, 1984 Training: O.E.A. collected both pre- and post-training data. On the first day of training participants were asked to complete pre-training assessment questionnaires. These questionnaires provided demographic data, information about participants' level of comfort with various curriculum topics, data on their knowledge of teaching strategies for FL/SE, and information about their preparation for meeting the objectives for the curriculum. A total of 391 questionnaires were completed. In January, 1985, follow-up training sessions for high school personnel took place. Participants were given post-assessment forms to complete at the conclusion of this training. In addition, post-training questionnaires were mailed to elementary and intermediate/junior high school personnel who had attended the original citywide training program. These post-training questionnaires once again asked teachers about their comfort with teaching FL/SE and requested information about the usefulness of the training and the support provided by the health coordinators. A total of 260 questionnaires were completed. Both pre-training and post- training questionnaires were completed by 237 people. The questionnaires were analyzed by examining frequency distributions of responses and comparison of means on matched items. (See Appendix A for a summary of the characteristics of teachers completing the pre-training and post-training questionnaires.)

Findings include:*

- Ninety-two percent of the respondents indicated that the training was adequate in providing factual information.

---

*Possible ratings for items were "more than adequate," "adequate," "somewhat inadequate," and "very inadequate."

- Seventy-six percent indicated that the training was adequate in providing teaching strategies. When analyzed by level of teaching, 66 percent of elementary school teachers, 72 percent of intermediate and junior high school teachers, and 86 percent of high school teachers found the training adequate in this area.

- Eighty-one percent agreed that the training provided adequate opportunity to clarify personal values. When analyzed by level of teaching, 77 percent of elementary school teachers, 83 percent of intermediate and junior high school teachers, and 83 percent of high school teachers found the training was adequate in this area.

Data from the pre- and post-assessment survey (see Table 6) concerning teacher level of comfort with various curriculum content areas suggest that the majority of teachers were comfortable with most of the content prior to training. In general, teachers felt the greatest discomfort with the topics of sexual abuse and individual expressions of sexuality, such as homosexuality and bisexuality. On all topics, however, the mean score decreased significantly following training, indicating a higher level of comfort.

Special Education

Between January and March, 1985, H.P.E.U. and the Division of Special Education conducted 22 hours of training in four separate sessions for 40-50 special education personnel at the Floating Hospital. This training focused on the adaptation of the curriculum for special education students. After attending this training, participants were expected to train other special education teachers throughout the school system. The majority of special education personnel attending this training were from the targeted C.S.D.s.

Borough Training

In June, 1985, each of the H.P.E.U.'s five borough coordinators provided

Table 6

Teacher Ratings[a] of Comfort Teaching FL/SE
Before and After August, 1984 Training Sessions

FL/SE Content Areas	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Posttest Mean	Posttest S.D	Change in Mean[b]
Sexual Growth and Development	1.6	.6	1.3	.6	-.3
Gender Roles	1.6	.6	1.4	.6	-.2
Decision-making and Peer Pressure	1.5	.6	1.3	.5	-.2
Contraception	1.6	.9	1.3	.9	-.3
Sexually Transmitted Diseases	1.6	.8	1.3	.8	-.3
Individual Expressions Including Homosexuality and Bisexuality	1.9	.9	1.6	.9	-.3
Teenage Pregnancy	1.5	.8	1.3	.7	-.2
Interpersonal Family Relationships	1.6	.6	1.4	.6	-.2
Interpersonal Peer Relationships	1.6	.7	1.4	.5	-.2
Sexual Abuse	1.9	.7	1.6	.7	-.3

[a]Possible ratings ranged from 1 to 4, with one representing "Very Comfortable" and 4 "Very Uncomfortable".

[b]A negative change in the mean indicates a greater degree of comfort. All differences are significant at the $p < .001$ level.

° Most teachers reported being comfortable with FL/SE content areas prior to training. Training did result, however, in higher comfort ratings for all content areas.

24 hours of additional staff development training for personnel in the targeted C.S.D.s who had not previously been trained. This additional training was offered in response to requests made by the districts. The training focused on the following: specific teaching strategies; factual information; the new curriculum; and personal attitudes and experiences as they relate to FL/SE. At least 15 new participants from nine of the eleven targeted C.S.D.s attended these sessions.

Teacher Evaluation: Post-training questionnaires were completed by 118 participants in the borough-wide training sessions conducted by the H.P.E.U. coordinators.* Findings include:

- Over 90 percent of the participants found the training relevant to their teaching needs.
- In general, participants agreed that the training totally or partially met each of the following stated objectives; to provide concrete ideas and suggestions for classroom teaching; to provide factual information in the area of FL/SE; to help prepare teachers for the introduction of the new curriculum; and, to help clarify personal attitudes and experience as they relate to teaching FL/SE.

Summer, 1985 Training**

From June 27-July 2, 1985 a training program similar to the one

---

* Post-training data were collected from elementary and intermediate/junior high school personnel prior to the six hours of formal follow-up training. Those high school teachers attending the March of Dimes follow-up training did not complete the post-training questionnaire.

** Since this training was for personnel who will be teaching in the 1985-86 academic year, it is only included in this evaluation to note its availability to the nine C.S.D.s that were part of the initial year's implementation effort.

conducted in summer, 1984 was held at Norman Thomas High School. This program was designed for those C.S.D.s which will implement the program for the first time in 1985-86. In response to requests from the nine targeted C.S.D.s already implementing the program, 15 spaces were allotted to each of these C.S.D.s for personnel not previously trained. A total of 154 teachers and supervisors from the nine target C.S.D.s attended.

Overall, a total of 806 persons from the 11 targeted C.S.D.s and the high schools received at least 24 hours of centralized training in 1984-85: 614 elementary and intermediate/junior high school teachers, 45 special education personnel, and 147 high school personnel.

FOLLOW-UP TRAINING

H.P.E.U.'s goal was to provide 30 hours of training to all teachers and supervisors implementing FL/SE. This training included the 24-hour introductory training sessions and six hours of follow-up sessions designed to meet the needs of personnel at different levels of teaching. After the August, 1984 training program, six hours of follow-up training were offered to all of the teachers who had attended. Also invited to join these follow-up sessions were teachers and administrators in Bronx and Manhattan high school pilot programs and staff in elementary school pilot programs in Manhattan, Bronx, and Queens who had been trained prior to August, 1984.

Follow-up training for elementary and intermediate/junior high school personnel consisted of the following:

- A one-day six-hour training session held on March 2, 1985, conducted by H.P.E.U. and attended by 70 elementary school teachers, 60 intermediate/junior high school teachers, and 14 supervisors.

- A six-hour follow-up training session conducted by C.S.D. 15 for its own staff in the fall.

Follow-up training for high school personnel consisted of the following:

- Three separate six-hour sessions were offered on January 23, 24, and 25 by H.P.E.U.'s high school coordinator for high school teachers and administrators. A total of 106 teachers, 2 guidance counselors, and 10 administrators attended these sessions.

- A parenting education training program for high school teachers given by H.P.E.U. in conjunction with the March of Dimes was offered as an alternative to the three January sessions because of its relevance to FL/SE. A total of 66 high school teachers attended this program.

In general, the follow-up sessions provided teachers with a forum for improving their teaching skills and for sharing their concerns about the curriculum implementation process. The participants addressed questions to the H.P.E.U. staff, shared local concerns with each other, and participated in workshops that focused on particular content areas and teaching strategies.

ADDITIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

At the request of individual schools, the FL/SE borough coordinators conducted additional staff development at the local level. Teachers in C.S.D.s 13, 15, and 31 had additional training, as did high school teachers from Taft, Grover Cleveland, and Clara Barton High Schools. Also, 35 drug counselors and guidance supervisors in C.S.D. 18 received over ten hours of training concerning FL/SE issues. The borough coordinators and the health coordinators in the nine targeted C.S.D.s also provided help to individual teachers upon request, through meetings or phone consultations. Although data were not available on the number of hours devoted to individual staff development, such informal training was confirmed by C.S.D. personnel during interviews.

VI. STUDENT OUTCOMES

This chapter presents descriptive analyses of student achievement regarding FL/SE. According to H.P.E.U., the following would be considered indicators of student achievement:

- a greater knowledge of FL/SE content;
- a positive shift in attitudes as reflected by a greater tolerance toward others, greater self-esteem, less stereotyping of sex roles, etc; and
- a change in willingness to take responsibility for one's actions and a willingness to become a more responsible member of one's family.

O.E.A. used two instruments to collect these data - a test to measure student knowledge and attitudes and a student opinion questionnaire.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND ATTITUDES

Pretests were administered to 411 junior high school students in grades seven through nine and 357 high school students in grades ten through twelve. Posttests were administered to 344 junior high and 312 high school students. Tests were administered in six junior high schools and six high schools throughout New York City.

The high school tests were analyzed using matched samples. There were 200 high school students with complete tests results. A correlated *t*-test was computed. Junior high tests were analyzed by comparing unmatched group data, due to variations in the way students completed the identification section of the achievement questionnaire. A *t*-test for independent samples was used to analyze these data.

The results for the junior high school students are presented in Table 7. Student pretest-posttest gains were statistically significant for the items related to sex roles, self-esteem, knowledge, and sexual abuse. The results for the high school students are presented in Table 8. Student pretest-posttest gains were statistically significant for the items related to sex roles, decision-making, and knowledge.*

STUDENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRES

The student opinion questionnaire was designed to gather information on students' perceptions of the FL/SE program and was administered during the spring, 1985 term. It was completed by 345 students from five junior high schools and three high schools. Nearly all of the 345 students reported that they could comfortably ask questions in class, three-quarters felt that they could share their opinions, and even more answered that different points of view were respected.

Three-quarters of the students responded that they were encouraged to speak with parents and family members. Fifty-four percent indicated that they actually spoke more with parents about these subjects and 55 percent reported that they actually spoke more with friends as a result of the FL/SE class. Eighty percent believed that the FL/SE program would make it easier to speak about these subjects with parents and other family members in the future (see Table 9).

Students were also asked to name the three most important things they had learned in their FL/SE class. Responses covered a wide range of topics.

---

* It should be noted that students obtained high pretest scores on the knowledge items. This may be attributable to the fact that some of this information is covered in required science courses.

Table 7

Analysis of Junior High School Students' Scores on the Sex Education Test

Sub-test	Pretest[a] Mean	Pretest[a] S.D.	Posttest[b] Mean	Posttest[b] S.D.	Mean Difference[c]
Sex Roles and Family	14.5	2.7	15.2	2.5	+0.5
Decision making and Responsibility	11.1	2.0	11.1	2.0	0.0
Self-esteem and Peer Pressure	22.7	3.0	23.1	3.0	+0.4
Knowledge	22.6	5.0	23.7	5.2	+1.1
Sexual Abuse	5.9	1.4	6.2	1.4	+0.3

[a] N= 411
[b] N= 344
[c] All mean gains were statistically significant.

° Junior high school students demonstrated gains on all subtests, except for Decision Making and Responsibility.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8

Analysis of High School Students' Scores on the Sex Education Test

Sub-test	Pretest[a]		Posttest[a]		Mean Difference[b]
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Sex Roles and Family	29.6	4.7	30.2	4.6	+0.6
Decision making and Responsibility	40.6	4.1	41.5	4.4	+0.9
Self-esteem and Peer Pressure	30.8	3.3	30.8	3.3	0.0
Knowledge	21.2	4.5	23.6	4.6	+2.1

[a] N= 200
[b] All mean gains were statistically significant.

° High school students demonstrated gains on all subtests, except for Self-Esteem and Peer Pressure.

Table 9

Distribution of Student Responses to the
Student Opinion Questionnarie

Item	Often	Sometimes	Very Little	Not at All
I can comfortably ask questions	50%	40%	9%	1%
I can share my opinions	33%	41%	19%	5%
Different points of view were respected	31%	54%	11%	2%
Students were encouraged to talk to their parents and family members	43%	31%	15%	8%
I talk with my parents about topics we never discussed before I took these classes	26%	28%	19%	29%
I talk with my friends about topics we had never discussed before I took these classes	24%	31%	21%	23%
I think these classes will make it easier for me to talk with my parents and family members when I have questions of concern	47%	33%	11%	8%

- Nearly all of the students reported that they could comfortably ask questions in class.
- Three-quarters of the students responded that they were encouraged to speak with parents and family members about FL/SE.

More than half of the students listed sexually transmitted diseases and birth control. Forty-two percent of the students stated that among the three most important things they had learned about were anatomy and physiology, and nearly a third of the students cited communication, especially with parents (see Table 10).

Students were also asked for suggestions to improve their FL/SE class. Nineteen percent believed students should take the class more seriously; eight percent recommended that students use what they've learned to make responsible decisions; two percent noted that other students would benefit from receiving FL/SE instruction from the teacher from whom they had received instruction. There was little criticism. The one criticism most frequently voiced, however, was the lack of sufficient discussion time. Other suggestions included: shy students should not be pushed to participate in class; more films should be offered; and the class should be more interesting (see Table 11). Overall, the student data reflect support for the program.

Table 10

Student Responses to Student Opinion Questionnaire Item
"What Were the Three Most Important Things You Learned?"

Topic	Number	Percentage
Sexually transmitted diseases	110	55
Birth control	109	55
Anatomy and physiology	84	42
Communication, especially with parents	61	31
Taking responsibility for my actions/ being able to say "no"	49	25
Pregnancy, especially teenage	48	24
Respect for differing views/clarification of own views	34	17
Family life/parenting	30	15
Self-respect	26	13
Dispelling myths about sex	21	11
Rape/sexual abuse	12	6
Dating	7	4
Other	13	7

- More than half of the students reported that sexually transmitted diseases and birth control were among the three most important things learned from FL/SE.
- Nearly a third of the students reported that communication, especially with parents, was one of the three most important things learned from FL/SE.

Table 11

Student Responses to Student Opinion Questionnaire Item:
"Suggestions for Making the Class Better"

Suggestion	Number of Students Responding	Percentage of Students Responding
More discussion	65	30
Good; no change necessary	42	19
Students should be more serious	24	11
FL/SE should have more time	22	10
Students should use what they've learned	18	8
Need more films/speakers	17	8
Don't push the shy students	9	4
Make class more interesting	5	2
All students should have my teacher	4	2
Other	14	6

- Nearly one-third of the students stated that more time for discussion would improve their classes.
- Generally, responses indicate that students are satisfied with the FL/SE program.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings presented in this report indicate that, overall, during 1984-85, the first year of the revised Family Living Including Sex Education curriculum program, implementation was largely successful. Conclusions based on analyses of program achievement data were as follows:

- The final version of the FL/SE curriculum was approved, printed, and distributed; in addition, an addendum on child sexual abuse was written.
- Staff development sessions were well attended and were perceived by participants as having been useful to them. Participants especially valued the opportunities to learn specific teaching strategies and to share ideas and concerns with one another. There was an increase in level of comfort with all subjects taught in the curriculum.
- Parent workshops engendered enthusiasm and support from parents.
- Individual districts formed District Advisory Councils that were suited to their needs.
- Student achievement and opinion data revealed that students improved in their knowledge of FL/SE issues; students also believe that they have grown more confident about discussing FL/SE issues.
- Program-developed audiovisual materials were perceived by program participants as significant in securing the participation of the eight new community school districts.
- Eight new community school districts wish to begin curriculum implementation in fall, 1985.
- Overall, reports from individual C.S.D.s indicated that H.P.E.U. had provided them with necessary support and assistance.
- H.P.E.U. established a positive working relationship with other agencies as well as with other divisions within the Board of Education.

- H.P.E.U. has begun to address problems in communication between community school board members and district superintendents: H.P.E.U. has revised FL/SE policy for 1985-86 so that both the superintendent and the school board must sign a consent form in order for a district to send staff for training.

- All districts where FL/SE was taught during 1984-85 reported plans to continue the program and to expand it.

The following recommendations are offered:

- Support and encourage district responsibility for the FL/SE program, so that H.P.E.U. may serve as a central resource;

- Continue efforts to improve and expand staff development: include advanced training packages for experienced FL/SE teachers and for more experienced teachers, include more specific teaching strategies and lesson plans and gear them to smaller groups by grade level; if possible, restructure training sessions to meet the needs of individual districts; and continue to encourage school administrators to participate in the H.P.E.U. training;

- Continue efforts to provide more resource materials;

- Continue efforts to secure parent involvement by making parent workshops more accessible to working parents; also, increase efforts to provide materials for Spanish-speaking parents;

- Be responsive to students' concerns; currently, one of their major concerns is that more discussion time be integrated into the FL/SE program; and

- Continue efforts through work with parents, C.S.D. personnel and Community School Board members to bring more C.S.D.s into the program.

APPENDIX A
Table A

Demographic Data on Teachers Completing Training
Pre- and Post-assessment Forms

	Pre-training Questionnaire		Post-training Questionnaire	
C.S.D.	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1	1	0.3	4	1.5
2	36	9.2	25	9.6
9	13	3.3	11	4.2
10	24	6.1	18	6.9
13	20	5.1	9	3.5
15	38	9.7	19	7.3
22	26	6.6	21	8.0
29	11	2.8	7	2.7
31	34	8.7	17	6.6
32	33	8.4	20	7.7
H.S.	144	36.8	46[a]	17.7
Non-targeted	7	1.8	11	4.2
Not specified	4	1.0	52	20.0
	391	99.8	260	99.8

[a] Probably underreported. Data on level of school indicates 117 H.S. personnel completed questionnaire. It is possible that those who did not specify are high school personnel.

Table A (con't)

Demographic Data on Teachers Completing Training
Pre- and Post-assessment Forms

	Pre-training		Post-training	
Position	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Teacher	340	87.0	232	89.2
Principal	15	3.8	7	2.7
Supervisor	3	0.8	1	0.4
Guidance Counselor	8	2.0	8	3.1
Coordinator	11	2.8	5	1.9
Cluster	4	1.0	3	1.2
Not Specified	10	2.6	4	1.5
	391	100	160	100
Level of School				
Elementary	127	32.5	70	26.9
IS/JHS	106	27.1	71	27.3
H.S.	145	37.1	117	45.0
Other	13	3.3	2	0.8
	391	100.0	260	100.0
Number years teaching				
< 10	96	24.5	48	18.5
10 - 20	224	57.3	154	59.2
> 20	68	17.4	58	22.3
Not Specified	3	0.8		
	391	100	260	100

°Teachers were trained from elementary, intermediate/junior high, and high schools in relatively equal proportions.